

GRAND STAIRCASE ESCALANTE NATIONAL MONUMENT (GSENM)

MONUMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

TUESDAY, Sept. 28, 2004
WEDNESDAY, Sept 29, 2004

CANNONVILLE VISITOR CENTER – CONFERENCE ROOM (9-28-04)
ESCALANTE INTERAGENCY OFFICE – CONFERENCE ROOM (9-29-04)

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Archaeology:	Joel C. Janetski, PhD
Botany:	Lawrence Edward Stevens, PhD
Garfield County:	Clare Ramsay
Kane County:	Ray Spencer
Educator:	Carol Ann Sullivan
Environmental:	Larry D. Davis
Geology:	Robert E. Blackett
History:	Jerry Roundy, PhD
Ranching:	Que Johnson
Outfitter/Guide:	A. Jean Seiler
Paleontology:	Scott D. Sampson, PhD
Social Science:	Julie Brugger
State or Tribes:	Scott Truman
Systems Ecology:	Paul Evangelista
Wildlife Biology:	Norman Ray McKee

DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL:

Dave Hunsaker, GSENM Manager

CHAIR & FACILITATOR:

A. Jean Seiler

RECORDERS & LOGISTICS:

Allysia Angus, GSENM Land Use Planner
Marietta Eaton, GSENM, Assistant Monument Manager

AGENDA - DAY ONE – SEPTEMBER 28, 2004

WHAT	HOW	WHO	TIME	START TIME
Start-ups: Welcome & Intros	• Present	• Jean • All	5'	9:30
Check in	• Present	• Jean • All	10'	9:35
Catch up	• Present	• Dave Hunsaker • All	10'	9:45
Prior Meeting Notes & Agreements	• Present • Q & A	• Jean Seiler • All	10'	9:55
Purpose & Desired Outcomes	• Propose & Review	• Jean Seiler • All • Recorder	5'	10:00
Agenda Housekeeping	• Presentations • Q & A and Clarifications	• Jean Seiler • All	5' 5'	10:05
Roles Ground Rules	Decision making process • Present • Q & A • Clarify	• Jean Seiler • Dave Hunsaker • All	5'	10:15
Monument GIS	• Present • Q & A	• Cory Black	60'	10:20
BREAK			20'	11:20
Monument Updates & Emerging Issues	• Present • Q & A	• VCs & Exhibits - Brian Bellew • GSENM Web Site – Allysia Angus • Dave Hunsaker • All	10' 10' 10'	11:40
LUNCH & Tour of Cannonville VC			85'	12:10
Cont...Monument Updates & Emerging Issues EIS Update EIS Implementation Monitoring & Restoration Transportation Plan		• Rusty Lee • Dave Hunsaker	15' 15'	1:35

Fee Demo				
Marketing Analysis Efforts & Science Partnerships				
GRAZING SUBCOMMITTEE		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Julie Brugger • All • Recorder • Subcommittee 	60'	2:05
BREAK			20'	3:05
SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present • Q & A • Input: Q & A from Subcommittee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larry Stevens • All • Recorder • Subcommittee 	90'	3:25
BREAK			35'	4:55
Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present • Clarify • Q & A from Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Public • The MAC 	60'	5:30

AGENDA - DAY TWO – SEPTEMBER 29, 2004

WHAT	HOW	WHO	TIME	START TIME
Wednesday 9/29 Housekeeping Jean's mixer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present • Q & A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean Seiler • All 	5'	9:30
Start ups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present • Q & A • Clarify 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean Seiler • All 	25'	9:35
FEE SUBCOMMITTEE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present • Q & A from others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larry Davis • Dave Hunsaker • All • Recorder • All • Subcommittee 	15'	9:50
BREAK			20'	10:05
Archaeology Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joel Janetski 	55'	10:25
Tour Escalante VC Construction Site		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dave Hunsaker 	30'	11:20
LUNCH On your own		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 	70'	11:50
New Agenda Items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hunsaker • All 	60'	1:00
What's come up at this meeting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dave Hunsaker • All 	30'	2:00

Restoration Science – 5 year plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose new topics • Acknowledge • Check understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melissa Siders 	90'	2:30
Reintroductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose new topics • Acknowledge • Check understanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melissa Siders 		
Marketing partnerships Institute for Outdoor Recreation & Tourism (IORT)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean Seiler • Brian Bellew 		
BREAK			20'	4:00
Action Plans & Assignments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List (Actions & Tasks) • Agree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean Seiler • All • Recorder 	10'	4:20
Next Desired Outcomes (next meeting)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean • All 	15'	4:30
Meeting Evaluation (how does MAC feel about how it is going?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jean • All 	10'	4:50
ADJOURN				5:00

DAY ONE - 9:30 A.M.

PRESENT:

Advisory Committee Members

Lawrence Edward Stevens, PhD
Clare Ramsay
Ray Spencer
Carol Ann Sullivan
Larry D. Davis
Robert E. Blackett
Jerry Roundy, PhD
Que Johnson
A. Jean Seiler
Scott D. Sampson, PhD
Julie Brugger
Scott Truman
Paul Evangelista
Norman Ray McKee

Designated Federal Official

Dave Hunsaker, GSENM Manager

Bureau of Land Management

Marietta Eaton, Acting Science Administrator GSENM
Allysia Angus, Land Use Planner GSENM
Cory Black, GIS Specialist GSENM
Rusty Lee, Planning Lead GSENM
Melissa Siders, Wildlife Biologist GSENM

Public Attendees

Ken Sizemore
Jill Ozarski
Laura Kamala

Welcome and Introduction

Carol Sullivan, MAC Vice-Chair, filling in for Jean Seiler, welcomed everyone in attendance and mentioned housekeeping items. Round-robin of introductions took place, during which committee members responded to question of their perceptions and concerns of committee at this point.

- Dave Hunsaker noted that he was pleased with the progress thus far and that the Committee was right on track.
- Julie Brugger mentioned that she is still confused about role of MAC members and she would like to find out from all how they feel things are going.
- Paul Evangelista was concerned about how the Committee can work to promote new science in Monument (i.e. university involvement, Master's and PhD program opportunities, etc.).
- Scott Sampson, who's been working on the science report also wanted clarification about the point of what the Committee is doing. Where are they going?
- Ray Spencer noted that he thought Committee members were more concerned with how they are getting along, and that it's time to move along and make some decisions.
- Norm McKee, who's been working on both the Science and Grazing Reports, encouraged the Committee to move forward with some kind of actions, and the sooner the better.
- Joel Janetski asked about how do the efforts of the Committee can prove to be useful. He noted that Committee members need to work with related GSENM staff who are involved on specific projects and tasks.
- Bob Blackett suggested that the Committee assist GSENM in hosting workshops and another symposium. He noted the desire to knuckle down and get things moving.
- Jerry Roundy mentioned that he was happy there had been no increases in fee demo.
- Clare Ramsey agreed with comments of previous members.
- Scott Truman noted that the Committee needs input from Monument staff from the relevant specific programs. Particularly for the Rangeland Health Subcommittee, which would benefit from increased interaction with Monument staff.

- Que Johnson mentioned that he appreciated being aware of GSENM activities and programs and likes knowing about direction GSENM is headed.
- Carol Sullivan mentioned that she isn't quite sure what role she's to play as the educator representative. She is hoping to identify more specifics of what each member is to bring to the conversation and contribute to the recommendations.
- Larry Davis noted that the Fee Demo Subcommittee is waiting for additional direction. Since the first meetings where committee members were strangers, the group is learning to work together and can all work together to achieve what's best for GSENM and communities.

Catch-up

- Dave Hunsaker presented a White Paper on how to handle public comments. White paper was accepted and adopted. Any letters of response to public would go out on BLM letterhead with MAC tag line and be signed by Chair or a Vice Chair.
- Synopsis format for reports needs to be discussed and determined during this meeting.
- Altering membership of committee **would** require amending Management Plan. Plan Amendment requires public involvement and time to process.

Prior Meeting Notes and Agreements

- Provided Minutes and Executive Summary of Agreements.
- Approved Minutes unanimously.
- No audio CD copies of previous meeting were requested from the public.

Agenda

- Agenda was corrected to note meeting on Wednesday begins at 8 a.m.

Housekeeping

- Refreshments for this meeting provided by Kane County.
- MAC members to contribute \$5 at this meeting to cover snack costs for next meeting.

Ground Rules

Same ground rules from last meeting were considered appropriate to remain.

- Listen to understand
- Ask questions to understand
- One person speaking at a time
- Respect one another
- Cell phones and pagers to silent alarm

Purpose and Desired Outcomes

The Committee expressed the following during the discussion of the purpose and desired outcomes of this meeting:

- Get a clear idea what MAC is doing and where it's going
- What to do with reports, what actions will likely come to be as result of the reports
- Have more GSENM staff interaction
- Prioritization of efforts for future
- Be informed and aware of what's going on at GSENM
- Make a decision about what to do in regard to additional committee members
- Hear Sub-committee reports – recommendations
- Discuss and determine status of current, ad-hoc sub-committees (more or different subcommittees, adhoc to permanent, etc.)

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Presentation

Cory Black, GIS Specialist for GSENM, provided a overview presentation of the GIS technologies utilized, data sets available, how the data is/can be used, and how that data can be shared with committee members and the public.

MAC Website

Allysia Angus gave a brief demo of the updates made to the MAC pages of the GSENM website. Individual images and several bios have been added. Other previously requested changes were made.

Visitor Centers and Interpretive Exhibits Update

Jeanie Linn, Visitor Center Manager for GSENM on north end of Monument gave a presentation on the status of the new visitor centers and corresponding interpretive exhibits. She noted that Congress appropriated funds for the Visitor Centers (VC) after the Monument was designated and that local government groups suggested the sizes and locations of the four facilities. All total, \$7.6 Mil was appropriated for building design and construction and \$2.1 Mil for the interpretive exhibits. The ultimate goal will be to tie core curriculum to VC exhibits and the education program.

Changing exhibit space is available in each facility. Dedicated funding is not in place for subsequent exhibits.

GSENM has agreements with three local Natural History Associations and is working toward having a single agreement.

Jeanie provided some statistics on the various facilities:

Escalante Interagency Visitor Center

- Construction is almost complete.
- Will still house three agencies - Dixie NF, Glen Canyon NRA, and GSENM-BLM.
- 17,000 SF total including office, exhibit, lab, theater, and conference room space.
- Interpretive Theme is Ecology.
- Lab spaces for visiting scientists will be for any science discipline. MAC may want to help determine protocols for use of lab spaces.

- Visitation at Escalante VC...jumped after designation, has leveled out now. Spring and Fall are busiest times of year. May is the busiest month for visitation.

VISITOR CENTERS
MONTHLY TOTALS
OCTOBER 2003-SEPTEMBER 2004

Month	Boulder	Cannonville	Escalante	Big Water	Kanab	TOTAL
October	808	1682	3941	981	780	8192
November	168	193	677	314	251	1603
December	94	Closed	239	Closed	186	519
January	63	Closed	129	93	234	519
February	77	Closed	135	closed	201	413
March	348	Closed	2094	562	550	3554
April	918	1698	3885	889	689	8079
May	1160	2032	4328	1257	816	9593
June	1243	1872	2933	1135	779	7962
July	1222	1911	2797	2080	1116	9126
August	1248	1609	2231	2656	939	8683
September	1176	2164	3436	3052	1094	10,922
TOTAL	8525	13,161	26,825	13,019	7635	69,165

GSENM Visitation Totals

Year	Total
2000	572,176
2001	683,286
2002	670,000
2003	695,900

Cannonville Visitor Center –

- BLM purchased land from the city.
- Building design process 2000-01.
- Opened early spring 2002.
- Interpretive theme is “Human Geography” - Pauite and Pioneer relationships with land.
- Exhibits installed 2004.

Big Water Visitor Center

- Interpretive theme is paleontology.
- Visitation numbers are continuing to go up.

Kanab Visitor Center

- Interpretive theme is archeology and geology.

Emerging Issues

GSENM Transportation Plan

Dave Hunsaker shared map of transportation plan. He noted that this was not the time to have a discussion about RS2477. GSENM's Transportation plan was established during the planning process and accommodates use for motorized and some non-motorized vehicles. There are approximately 1000 miles of road open throughout the Monument; of those approximately 600 miles are open to ATV use. Road numbering signs are in the ground in Kane County. GSENM currently has a numbering system that uses numbers from the 100-700s. Currently, Kane and Garfield Counties are working to define numbers that match up and make it easier for users, orientation, and safety. Dave noted that GSENM is not wed to the existing numbered system - willing to use whatever numbers the counties decide upon.

Dave was asked if there's an effort to adjust segments of road that may be inaccurately classified? He responded that mapping errors can and will be adjusted and corrected. However, Plan Amendments are required to make changes to the Transportation Plan; including any new roads or those requiring new construction.

Questions about weeds and wildlife corridors, restoration protocols, archeological site damage and historic trail designations were posed by Committee members. Archeological sites damaged by road maintenance are being inventoried and salvaged. Historic trails in the area include the Hole in the Rock Trail, the Old Spanish Trail, and the Boulder Mail Trail.

Fee Demo

Dave Hunsaker noted that there are a couple bills in Congress pertaining to Fee Demo. One would make Fee Demo permanent for all agencies currently using it, and the other would make it permanent only for the NPS. BLM has given testimony at national level.

Friends of the Monument

The Friends of the Monument (FOM) group, a private, non-profit, has formed and has signed a Cooperative Agreement with GSENM. This group will work toward becoming GSENM's Natural History Association. The Friends started in Kanab, and has representatives from areas within the Monument region. The group has a 15 member board and Larry Davis is one of the elected officers. It is a non-partisan, non-political group whose goal is to support GSENM's mission by increasing funding, public awareness, and support.

Marketing Analysis Efforts and Scientific Partnerships

Dave Hunsaker brought forward the concept of studying economic opportunities regionally and how GSENM fits within this. Can science education and outreach meld into an economic development opportunity? Could this extend the shoulder seasons? Are there niche marketing opportunities? Heritage and eco-tourism are currently quite popular.

Joel Janetski recommended treading lightly here because the early, on-the-ground phases of a research project are the most exciting, but much work is needed after the

field work phase is completed. One must be aware that much of the science comes after the field work is done and this less exciting phase is harder to fund.

Paul Evangelista commented that much of the science on GSENM may not be so exciting to the general public and that he would hate to see “non-exciting” science slip to the back burner.

Scott Truman noted the need to treat all disciplines as equally as possible but that we could consider capitalizing on the more ‘sexy’ disciplines (i.e. human history).

Scott Sampson noted that GSENM has potential to integrate science/education to visitors and that we could establish a niche, trend, destination, etc., that is overlooked by National Park Service. This should include the range of science disciplines and seek to explain how they are related and how humans likewise relate.

It was also noted that GSENM shouldn’t seek to compromise what we were established for. Subject to be revisited the following day.

Rangeland Health EIS Update

Rusty Lee (Noel Logan’s replacement as GSENM Planning Lead) provided an update on the Rangeland Health EIS. He noted that the EIS is on track and that alternatives are being finalized and honed. The range of alternatives basically include:

- No change
- Heavy grazing
- Light grazing

A working draft of the EIS is to be in the State Office for review in December 2004. Grazing permittee interviews are 90% complete. There are approximately 100 permittees on 97 allotments. Allotment management plans have been drafted with approximately 8 needing to be ground-truthed. GSENM is starting the impact assessments of the various alternatives.

GSENM Wildlife Reintroductions

Melissa Siders provided an overview of wildlife reintroduction efforts on GSENM. Get copy of document from Missy. See Appendix A for full details.

GSENM Restoration Projects

Melissa Siders provided an overview of restorations efforts on GSENM. See Appendix B for full details. The question was raised about how to evaluate non-native seed use and success. Larry Stevens offered experiment protocols from lessons learned on other projects he’s been involved with. He suggested that rigorous scientific set up is needed as well as long-term experimentation looking at methodology and success.

Grazing Sub-committee - Grazing Report

Julie Brugger shared the updated draft of the Grazing Sub-committee's Report. Que Johnson asked if GSENM is seeking to cut back cattle AUMs via the Rangeland Health EIS to levels at which ranchers won't be able to survive.

Dave Hunsaker replied that there is not a concerted effort to remove cattle from the Monument. However, there is a concern about the health of the. Laws mandate that rangeland health standards be met.

Dave Hunsaker noted that he appreciates the report which contains recommendations using specific language that can be useful for the Ranglenad Health EIS. He asked about how it can move into a final format.

Scott Truman noted that the report's purpose is to share the historical perspective that leads to today's perceptions about grazing in the region.

The report included the following issues with specific recommendations for dealing with them:

- Issue I: Need to see results on the ground. There is a need for local communities to see something positive come out of the Monument.
- Issue II: Need for better communication – importance of communication followed by action.
- Issue III: Access.
- Issue IV: Grazing buyouts.
- Issue V: Science program should include research, innovation, and experimental programs in range management. This should be specific to this portion of the Colorado Plateau.
- Issue VI: There is a need for voice, representation, support, and education for ranchers; an organization that can deal with BLM so ranchers don't always have to as individuals.
- Issue VII: The Impact of Monument management decisions, as it manages grazing on the Monument, on the local economy, culture/social makeup of the Monument and the communities of the Monument.

It was mentioned that the Monument could be a showcase example of healthy rangeland and watersheds which have the byproduct of viable, responsible, and sustainable ranching operations.

It was decided that comments (digitally if a few; hard copy if many) on this draft Grazing Report should be forwarded to Julie Brugger by October 13, and that Scott Truman and Julie will incorporate them into the final draft by October 27. The sub-committee will meet in late October. The revised draft is to be sent out to the rest of the committee with a set date for turnaround (approximately two weeks) for final approval prior to submittal to GSENM. Final is to be provided to Dave Hunsaker by early December.

Public Comments

Laura Kamala – Grand Canyon Trust (GCT)

- Laura responded to Page 11 of the Grazing Report Draft by disagreeing with statements contained, specifically that GCT doesn't consider economic impacts of their project, which she countered are seriously considered. Laura also suggested that the sub-committee refer to the updated GCT website for current information.

Jill Ozarski - Wilderness Society – Four Corners

- Jill requested that GSENM and the MAC share paperwork that is being discussed during the meeting with those in attendance from the public. She also requested that GSENM get meeting up on website as soon as possible and that the public be informed earlier about upcoming meeting schedules and agendas.
- Jill reported that the NLCS/National Monuments Coalition is currently working to secure funding for NLCS units for the 2006 fiscal year by working with President's budget staff. They are requesting that NLCS units' budgets be increased by \$6 Mil. A 10% overall cut in BLM-wide budgets is projected.
- The coalition is producing an annual report card on NLCS progress. The primary audience for the report card is Congress and the administration. It is due out next year. The Sonoran Institute is providing economic information.
- Jill commented on the discussion about the role of the MAC. She pointed out that the MAC is supposed to have a science focus and is to assist with evaluating the implementation of the GSENM Management Plan.
- Jill also mentioned that at the national level a strategy for promoting the BLM - NLCS units to serve as outdoor science laboratories is being developed.

DAY TWO, 8:00 a.m.

PRESENT

Advisory Committee Members

Joel C. Janetski, PhD
Lawrence Edward Stevens, PhD
Clare Ramsay
Ray Spencer
Carol Ann Sullivan
Larry D. Davis
Robert E. Blackett
Jerry Roundy, PhD
Que Johnson
A. Jean Seiler
Scott D. Sampson, PhD
Julie Brugger
Scott Truman
Paul Evangelista
Norman Ray McKee

Designated Federal Official

Dave Hunsaker, Monument Manager

Bureau of Land Management

Brian Bellew, Assistant Monument Manager - Visitor Services
Marietta Eaton, Acting Science Administrator
Allysia Angus, Land Use Planner GSENM

Public Attendees

Laura Kamula
Jill Ozarski
Steve Roberts
Ken Sizemore

Housekeeping

- Agenda was updated to reflect changes.
- Steve Roberts was welcomed to meeting.

Fee Demo Sub-committee

Larry Davis noted that the topic of fee demo has moved to the backburner. He noted that there are currently two bills before Congress that deal with fee demo. Copies of an email received from Scotty Phillips were distributed to the MAC. The email, which expressed strong opposition to new fees at GSENM, was read aloud into the meeting record.

Additional MAC Membership

A lengthy discussion of whether or not additional seats should be added to the MAC ensued. It was noted that adding additional seats would require an amendment to the Management Plan, but that the process for change exists.

Several members felt that a seat for a Native American representative should be added. The GSENM Management Plan and the current charter calls for a "State/Tribal" representative. Scott Truman represents the state in this seat currently. It was decided that Marietta will discuss the desire to have a seat on the MAC with the various tribes when she does the annual consultations, which are coming up. Scott Truman will attend these with Marietta to determine if there is interest.

Other MAC members suggested add a Range Science seat to the MAC. After lengthy discussion, it was decided that this discussion be tabled for now and at the next meeting have a presentation by one of the following range science academics/professionals about a current topic of interest (i.e. native vs. non-native vegetation for restoration, rangeland ecology):

Steve Monson
Richard Stevens
Steve Leonard
Scott Walker
Gregg Simmons
Extension service person
BLM Range person
Del Lefevre
Calvin Johnson
Ben Brown

At a later meeting, the issue of adding this type of representation to the MAC will be revisited.

Marketing Partnerships

Dave Hunsaker began the discussion about where GSENM fits into economic development spectrum of this area? Do we have a niche in regards to science, recreation, etc? Would it be beneficial to conduct a marketing analysis?

Ken Sizemore pointed out that there is clear direction in the GSENM Management Plan in Chapter 2 about how GSENM is to position itself and focus its energy.

A new sub-committee, Marketing/Partnerships/Revenue Sub-committee, was formed and a sign up sheet participation was sent around. Members include:

Carol Sullivan
Jean Seiler
Bob Blackett
Jerry Roundy
Ray Spencer
Scott Truman
Larry Davis

Archeology Overview

Joel Janetski gave an overview presentation on archeology of this area.

Science Sub-committee Report

Larry Stevens presented the Science Sub-committee's draft report on the GSENM Science Program.

A draft charter for the Science Sub-committee was included in the presentation and Larry asked whether or not these are needed for this sub-committee and/or the others. He requested comments from other MAC members on this topic.

Review and Prioritization of Research Projects

The question of whether or not the MAC should assist in reviewing research project proposals was raised. How would prioritization occur?

Larry's presentation the following types of priorities and analyzed them in terms of Knowledge/Supporting Data and Administrative Energy – (how much time spent on this topic/resource):

- Administrative Priorities
- Cultural Resource Priorities
- Ecosystem Priorities
- Geo-hydrological Priorities
- Socioeconomic Priorities
- Non-economic Biodiversity

Larry shared information on an approach to consider for prioritizing landscape planning efforts which includes identifying landscape hotspots of conflict and management priorities.

The following questions were raised:

- Which research projects should be reviewed by the science sub-committee or by outside, non-biased reviewers?
- Does GSEMN plan to produce resource plans per resource? Should the Science sub-committee help determine these?
- Should a schedule for production of research projects and reviews be determined?
- Do we want an annual statement on progress of science program? Marietta is working on a GSENM Science Program Annual Report and welcomes MAC support on formatting of this document. Marietta is to share GSENM research project wish list with MAC.

Information Management Recommendations

It was noted that GSENM needs an Information Management staff person to work with the library, bibliography, storage of materials, etc. Databases, current and older documents, specimens of plants and animals, etc. need to be accessible. Having reference collection on site is really valuable....This information management staff person would also work to make these materials available on-line. Joel Janetski and Paul Evangelista volunteered to head up an Information Management sub-sub-committee. It would cost \$10-60K in startup costs to establish electronic system of data management via contract.

Outreach Recommendations

- 2006 is GSENM's 10th anniversary. Major science symposium should be scheduled as part of the celebration.
- Outreach to general public is critical. Include local area representatives in information/outreach loop. MAC members should also do this outreach.
- Encourage legislators and/or staff to attend MAC meetings. MAC can't lobby for funding, but definitely can encourage support.
- Adopt "Learning from the Land" as overriding theme and include in all Visitor Information materials. Science should be promoted in all our outreach/informational products.

Facilitation of Science at Monument

- How should scientific review take place?
- Does research permitting process need to be streamlined?

Funding for Science Recommendations

How can funding for science be secured?

- Develop and fund staff position that works on securing grant funding.

Additional Items

Sub-committee Report Format

Dave Hunsaker to rough out a sub-committee report format for finalization at next meeting which will include how to include recommendations to GSENM. The draft format to go out soon so it can be used to produce the two current draft reports.

USU Front-Country Use Survey / Research Project

Brian Bellew shared a copy of the survey with MAC members. He noted that Fee Demo paid for this project. USU conducted the pilot last year and then finalized the survey for use this year. The resulting report from this project is due to us January 2005, so it should be available at the next MAC meeting. It was noted that this survey should have included science related questions and sought to find out if people came to see archeology sites or historic sites.

MAC Membership Terms and Charter

Those members serving on the MAC in two-year terms will be completed September 2005. A call for nominations will be forthcoming and will be conducted as with the first round. Those serving a two-year term were asked to consider whether they want to serve a second term.

MAC Charter also needs to be reauthorized. Should the current charter be used again? MAC Charter mandates an annual report.

Sub-committee Guidelines

Instead of charters, the sub-committee guidelines will be provided in draft form at the next meeting for discussion and approval.

Action Items

- Science Report Draft due by 12/31/2004.
- Grazing Report to MAC for review and then to Dave by early 12/2004.
- Review Charter.
- BLM to produce Annual Report with Executive Summary sub-component to go to elected officials, agencies, partners, and the public.
- Sub-committee reports format by next meeting.
- Marietta and Scott Truman to visit with tribes during consultations about MAC membership.

Next Agenda

Presentations on:

- Range related –
 - Rangeland Ecology or Revegetation/Restoration with natives vs. non-natives.
 - Large scale grazing issues.
 - BLM policy concerns, priorities (Lichthardt)
- Institute of Recreation and Tourism (IORT) presentation on USU Front-country Visitor Use Study.
- Future research ideas from MAC
- Report on Action Items
- Friends of the Monument (FOM) presentation
- Incorporation of education and outreach recommendations
- Budget update and specifics

- Wildlife reintroduction determinations
- Revegetation/restoration projects/determinations
- Presentation from Friends of the Monument (FOM)
- Results of tribal consultations.

Next Meeting and Adjournment:

The next MAC meeting will be held January 26-27, 2005 at a location yet to be determined in Kanab. On January 26 the meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. and on January 27 it will begin at 8:00 a.m.

The Monument Advisory Committee meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

APPENDIX A

Briefing to the Monument Advisory Council

Date: 28 September 2004

Subject: Native Wildlife Reintroductions on the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Prepared by: Missy Siders (Wildlife Biologist) and Dennis Pope (Biological Lead)
Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Plan Guidance

Fish and Wildlife Objectives (pg 12)

- Work in conjunction with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) in managing fish, wildlife, and other animals to achieve and maintain natural populations, population dynamics, and population distributions in a way that protects and enhances Monument resources
- Work cooperatively with the UDWR to reestablish populations of native species to historic ranges within the boundaries of the Monument, and to take needed actions to protect and enhance the habitat of these native species,
- FW-1: manage habitats for the recovery or reestablishment of native populations

Past Releases

Big Horn Sheep

Desert bighorn sheep (*Ovis canadensis nelsoni*) for release on Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (GSENM) were trapped along the shore of Lake Mead in Arizona in 1999 (21) and 2000 (20). Bighorn were trapped using aerial net guns and a helicopter. Bighorn were then transported to GSENM in horse trailers pulled by 4x4 pickups. All bighorn were fitted with ear tags, and a portion was fitted with radio transmitters (17 in 1999; 3 in 2000) to assist in future monitoring efforts.



Both the 1999 and 2000 trap/release efforts were cooperative projects between the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep (FNAWS), The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR), and the GSENM. Both FNAWS and DWR have expressed interest in expanding the current range of bighorn in GSENM to mirror historic numbers. Two years of monitoring data was collected by graduate students from Brigham Young University (BYU). Additional monitoring has been conducted periodically by UDWR and GSENM biologists. Lambs and adults have been spotted without ear tags, indicating that breeding and recruitment is taking place. GSENM

biologists continue to work towards bringing more sheep into the area and work towards maintaining a strong relationship with FNAWS and DWR.



Pronghorn

Pronghorn antelope (*Antilocapra americana*) for release on GSENM were trapped on Parker Mountain near Loa, Utah in 1999 (approximately 100) and 2000 (approximately 60). These animals were trapped by using a helicopter to locate and herd the animals into a large holding pen. At the holding pen all of the animals received a colored ear tag. Pronghorn were release on State and Monument administered lands in Kane County. Five of the pronghorn were fitted

with radio transmitters in 1999.

This pronghorn reintroduction effort was a cooperative effort between the UDWR and the GSENM. Future releases into the Monument are expected.

Future Releases

Additional Big Horn Sheep and Pronghorn Releases

An EA to evaluate the environmental effect of a proposal by UDWR to continue releases of bighorn sheep and pronghorn antelope in areas deemed historic habitat by the Monument and UDWR biologists was completed in 2001 (UT-030-01-027). The Escalante Wilderness Project appealed the decision based upon BLM's failure to include a "no predator control" alternative in the EA. In 2002, The Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) granted a stay on the proposal to authorize future releases of bighorn sheep and pronghorn antelope. Most recent news from IBLA is that we should have a decision within the next several weeks.

River Otter

An Environmental Assessment (EA) was completed for River Otter (*Lutra canadensis*) reintroduction into the Escalante River (UT-030-02-017) on 30-September-2002 and the FONSI signed 9-October-2002. River otter are a native species to the Colorado River system. UDWR proposes to reintroduce river otter into the upper reach of the Escalante River, a tributary of the Colorado River.



Reintroduction efforts are awaiting the completion of the UDWR state management plan for the River Otter.

This otter reintroduction effort is a cooperative effort between UDWR and GSENM. Otter researchers Dr. Tom Serfass¹ (Frostburg University) and Dr. Gene Rhodes² (Purdue University) have expressed interested in conducting genetic work for the project and assisting in the development of a monitoring program for the reintroduction efforts



Wild Turkey Augmentation

UDWR proposes to accomplish a number of releases in order to augment existing populations of wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*) currently inhabiting the Monument. An EA to evaluate the environmental effects of this proposal is currently in development. This proposal would include augmentation of Rio Grande (*M. g. intermedia*) and Merriam's (*M. g. merriami*) subspecies. These releases would be in furtherance of UDWR's adopted Strategic Management Plan for Wild Turkey. Turkey transplant sites would potentially be within 50 Mile Mountain; Paria River; Cottonwood Creek; Hackberry Canyon; Wahweap Creek; Last Chance Creek; Rogers Canyon; Alvey

Wash; Escalante River and its tributaries; and Canaan Mountain area.

We hope to have the EA completed and begin turkey releases in 2005.

¹ <http://www.frostburg.edu/dept/biol/faculty/tserfass.htm>

² <http://www.agriculture.purdue.edu/fnr/html/faculty/Rhodes/index.htm>

APPENDIX B

Briefing to the Monument Advisory Council

Date: 28 September 2004

Subject: Restoration and Revegetation on the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Prepared by: Missy Siders (Wildlife Biologist) and Holly Beck (Botany), Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

Monument Plan Guidance

Restoration and Revegetation Objectives (pg 30-31)

- Restoration is the process of returning disturbed areas to a natural array of native plant and animal associations. It not only denotes the return of the vegetation to the site, but also the return of the entire system functions that existed prior to disturbance.
- Revegetation is the process of putting vegetation back in an area where vegetation previously existed. The objective of revegetation projects is to stabilize areas that are disturbed and to prevent further degradation of a site.
- REV-1
 1. Restoration will be the goal whenever possible
 2. Native plants will be used as a priority
 3. Revegetation strategies will be used in areas of heavy visitation, where site stabilization is desired
 4. Restoration provisions will be included in all surface disturbing projects including provisions for post restoration monitoring of the area
 5. Priority for restoration or revegetation will be given to projects where Monument resources are being damaged.

Projects in Planning

Five-Mile Sagebrush Restoration

Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, Bureau of Land Management, will be preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA; UT-030-04-010-EA) to evaluate the environmental effects of vegetation restoration of sagebrush communities that have experienced widespread plant mortalities. Many of these sagebrush communities are currently experiencing soil erosion problems and are susceptible to wildfire and weed invasion.

This sagebrush restoration project proposes to convert stands of dead and decadent



sagebrush and range seedings to stable, healthy plant communities with a diverse species composition and age structure. Targeted restoration areas include approximately 31,000 acres along Highway 89, beginning roughly 20 miles east of Kanab. The EA should be out for public comment later this fall. Treatment would begin Fall 2005. **Contact:** Holly Beck (435-644-4327; hbeck@blm.gov)

Buckskin Mountain Wildlife Habitat Improvement

A Landscape Assessment was prepared for the Buckskin Mountains area (approx. 41,260 acre) located in the southern portion of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. The area includes the Buckskin Mountain Fuelwood area (approx. 19,440 acres). This area is composed of pinyon-juniper woodland and sagebrush flats. This area provides the Paunsagunt and Kaibab deer herds with primary and critical winter ranges, and transitional areas used during migration. The area is of great interest to the UDW, and Sportsmen for Fish and Wildlife, and a high priority for habitat improvement. The purpose of the Landscape Assessment is to document habitat conditions in pinyon-juniper woodlands and sagebrush shrub-steppe of the Buckskin Mountain portion of the GSENM; to synthesize historic and current information about such conditions; to recognize wildlife habitat needs; and to identify strategies for improving habitat conditions. It is intended to aid the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in determining the need for and developing management activities in Buckskin Mountains. The Assessment is not a decision document, only a means to identify problems and to explore possible solutions.

The Buckskin Mountains area is a highly disturbed system, resulting from or associated with woodcutting, off-road travel, ungulate (mule deer, elk, and cattle) grazing, drought, wildfires, and fire suppression. Vegetation data analysis results indicate that the woodland habitat is highly variable; understory vegetation is sparse; the pinyon pine and cliffrose components may be at risk; bare soil is common, and has associated erosion problems; exotic weeds (cheatgrass and Russian thistle) are limited at this time, but could expand. The sagebrush habitat is more dead than alive, with predominantly old, decadent plants; has very little understory grasses or forbs; and may be declining due to juniper encroachment in some portions of the area.



The Buckskin Mountain Assessment is out for internal review, and should be released for public comment within the next month. Once released to the public, GSENM will begin formulating possible management actions to improve the habitat on the Buckskin Mountains, and begin developing NEPA documents to bring those projects to fruition. This may result in a large-scale and relatively long-term restoration project. **Contact:** Missy Siders (435-644-4338; msiders@blm.gov).

Projects Underway

Reese Canyon

This is an on-going reclamation project at a Conoco/Phillips drill pad in Reese Canyon, off the Smokey Mountain Road. Seeding and transplanting will be conducted this Fall to supplement earlier efforts at reclamation. Growth conditions at the site will be improved with the addition of mulch and coarse woody debris. Pocket plantings will be implemented to mimic natural succession at the site. **Contact:** Holly Beck (435-644-4327; hbeck@blm.gov).



Circle Cliffs Mine Reclamation

This environmental assessment (EA; UT-030-03-007-EA) addresses the potential environmental impacts that could be associated with the Circle Cliffs Abandoned Mine Reclamation Project proposed by the Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining (DOGM). The project will be carried out by DOGM's Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program (AMRP) under the authority of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (P. L. 95-87) (SMCRA), and will be conducted in partnership with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The Utah AMRP has primacy in the state to conduct SMCRA authorized abandoned mine reclamation. The Western Regional Coordinating Center, Denver Field Office, Office of Surface Mining, U.S. Department of Interior, is the Federal agency which funds and oversees this program. All areas disturbed by construction activities associated with the mine closures will be seeded by hand broadcast using a native seed mix specified by the BLM, and will be seeded this Fall. **Contact:** Holly Beck (435-644-4327; hbeck@blm.gov).

Circle Cliffs Seeding

Approx. 3000 acres of rangeland seedings died due to drought. Approx. 1000 acres will be seeded this Fall. Funding for this year came from Sportmen for Fish and Wildlife (\$10,000) and Grazing Permit fees (\$40,000). Additional acres will be seeded as funding becomes available. The restoration of these seedings will involve the use of three different seed mixes and will test the role of introduced and native species in restoration of severely degraded sites. The Utah Division of Wildlife Resources is assisting the Monument with this project thorough use of equipment, seed supply, seed mixing, and annual monitoring. **Contact:** Rick Oyler (435-286-5606; royler@blm.gov).